



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/779,222	02/06/2001	Ernest F. Covelli	10002273-1	6647

7590 07/29/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	2

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/779,222	COVELLI ET AL. <i>[Signature]</i>	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Djenane M Bayard	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,8-12 and 15-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 6,7,13,14,19 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103.

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,275,853 to Beser et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,336,175 to Shaath et al.

a. As per claim 1, 8 and 15, Beser et al teaches a method for transferring data between a local device and a remote device over a network (See col. 2, lines 40-50). Furthermore, Beser et al teaches wherein the command specifies a plurality of identifiers. However, Beser et al fails to teach local device having a communication architecture having at least an application layer and an interceptor layer, receiving by said interceptor layer a first command from said application layer wherein said first command is configured to return an associated value for each identifier of said plurality of identifiers and issuing a second command by said interceptor layer, said second command specifying a second plurality of identifiers wherein said second command is configured to return a next identifier and associated value for each identifier of said another plurality of identifiers in response to said receiving of said first command.

Shaath et al teaches local device having a communication architecture having at least an application layer and an interceptor layer, receiving by said interceptor layer a first request from said application layer wherein said first command is configured to return an associated value for each identifier of said plurality of identifiers and issuing a second command by said interceptor layer, said second command specifying a second plurality of identifiers wherein said second command is configured to return a next identifier and associated value for each identifier of said another plurality of identifiers in response to said receiving of said first command (See col. 7, lines 28-45)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate local device having a communication architecture having at least an application layer and an interceptor layer, receiving by said interceptor layer a first command from said application layer wherein said first command is configured to return an associated value for each identifier of said plurality of identifiers and issuing a second command by said interceptor layer, said second command specifying a second plurality of identifiers wherein said second command is configured to return a next identifier and associated value for each identifier of said another plurality of identifiers in response to said receiving of said first command as taught by Shaath et al in the claimed invention of Beser et al in order not to alter data stored (See col. 2, lines 10-20).

b. As per claims 2, 9 and 16, Beser et al in view of Shaath et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Beser et al teaches a plurality of identifier to issue a command. However, Beser et al fails to teach modifying each identifier of said first plurality of

identifiers to an associated previous identifier to create said second plurality of identifiers; and issuing said second command specifying said second plurality of identifiers.

Shaath et al teaches modifying a first command to create a second command base on the first command (See col. 7, lines 28-45)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate modifying a first command to create a second command base on the first command as taught by Shaath et al in the claimed invention of Beser et al in order to block request (See col. 7, lines 35-40).

c. As per claims 3,10 and 17, Beser et al in view of Shaath et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Beser et al teaches receiving a plurality of next identifiers and a plurality of values from said remote device, wherein each next identifier of said plurality of next identifiers has a corresponding value among said plurality of values (See col. 3, lines 47-61)

d. As per claims 4 and 11, Beser et al in view of Shaath et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Beser et al fails to teach comparing one of said first plurality of identifiers with associated one of said plurality of next identifiers.

Shaath et al teaches comparing the intercepted command (See col. 2, lines 46-48).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate comparing the intercepted command as taught by Shaath et al in the claimed invention of Beser et al in order to block request (See col. 7, lines 35-40).

e. As per claim 5,12 and 18, Beser et al in view of Shaath et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Beser et al teaches updating said associated value of said one of first plurality of identifiers with corresponding value of said associated one of said plurality of next identifiers in response to said one of said first plurality of identifiers being equivalent to said associated one of plurality of next identifiers (See col. 3, lines 48-60)

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 6-7, 13-14, and 19-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,219,703 to Nguyen et al teaches a method and apparatus for constructing a device management information base in a network management station.

U.S. Patent No. 6,757,747 to Hooper teaches a proxy object for managing an application instance on a dataless client machine.

U.S. Patent No. 5,727,145 to Nessett et al teaches a mechanism for locating objects in a secure fashion.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M Bayard whose telephone number is (703) 305-6606. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Djenane Bayard



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER